

Applicant: Mark S. Cavin
Application No.: 10/707,312

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1-6 and 8-26 are currently pending in this application. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13-14 and 23-26 have been amended. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claim 25 contains allowable subject matter.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 8-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 as being dependent upon rejected claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that based on the claim amendments and the arguments below all rejected claims are allowable over the cited prior art. The withdrawal of the objection to the claims 8-12, 14, 16-19 and 21 is respectfully requested.

Applicant: Mark S. Cavin
Application No.: 10/707,312

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-7, 13, 15, 20, 22-24, 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pau (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,426) in view of Staszewski et al. (U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2004/0151257).

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner agrees that Pau does not disclose that the first radio IC generates and uses a local oscillator signal for radio transmission and/or radio reception operation, and wherein the local oscillator signal is coupled to the second radio IC for use in its radio transmission and/or radio reception operation. However, the Examiner states that Staszewski teaches a transceiver system including two separate circuits, one circuit for a transmitter and the other circuit for a receiver, where the transmitter comprises a local oscillator that is used for its function and couples to the receiver for use in its reception operation. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the two transmit and receive circuits of Staszewski into the two separated ICs of Pau in order to predistort signals coming into the receiver as taught by Staszewski. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Staszewski discloses a coupling element which provides a signal *from the transmitter path to the receiver path* in *one integrated transceiver circuit* (see paragraph 0005 and of Staszewski) (emphasis added). Staszewski only discloses

Applicant: Mark S. Cavin
Application No.: 10/707,312

one transceiver with one transmitter and one receiver, where the receiver portion and the transmitter portion utilize a common local oscillator (see paragraph 0037 of Staszewski). In contrast, amended independent claim 1 of the pending application recites a *first* radio IC configured to *generate and use* a local oscillator signal for radio transmission and/or radio reception operation, and wherein the local oscillator signal is coupled to the *second* radio IC for *use* in its radio transmission and/or radio reception operation (emphasis added). Further, amended independent claim 1 recites that the first and second radio ICs each comprises a bi-directional port circuit, the bi-directional port circuit in the second radio IC is configured to couple the local oscillator signal from the first radio IC for use by its radio transmitter or radio receiver. Neither Pau nor Staszewski disclose the use of a bi-directional port circuit configured to couple a local oscillator signal from one radio IC to another radio IC for use by its radio transmitter or radio receiver. Therefore, neither Pau nor Staszewski teach, alone or in combination, the elements of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 2-6 depend upon claim 1 and the Applicant believes these claims are allowable for the same reasons provided above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-7 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 13, the Examiner states that claim 13 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claims 15, 20 and 22 are

Applicant: Mark S. Cavin
Application No.: 10/707,312

dependent upon claim 13, which the Applicant believes is allowable over the cited prior art of record for the same reasons provided above. Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 13, 15, 20 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 23 and 24, the Examiner states claim 23 and 24 are rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C §103(a) rejection of claims 23 and 24 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 26, the Examiner states that claim 26 is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1 and further that Pau teaches phase and frequency co-herency between a first and second IC. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Amended independent claim 26 recites electrically coupling the local oscillator signal from the first radio IC to the second radio IC, wherein the first radio IC comprises a bi-directional port circuit, the bi-directional port circuit in the first radio IC coupling the local oscillator signal to a bi-directional port circuit of the second radio IC. Neither Pau nor Staszewski teach, alone or in combination, the above feature of amended independent claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 is allowed over the cited prior art.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

Applicant: Mark S. Cavin
Application No.: 10/707,312

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-7, 13, 15, 20, 22-24 and 26 is respectfully requested.

Applicant: Mark S. Cavin
Application No.: 10/707,312

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application, including claims 1-6 and 8-26, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark S. Cavin

By 
Wesley T. McMichael
Registration No. 56,982

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

WTM/JPB/ml